REMARKS

Claims 1 – 20 remain pending in the present Application.

Response to Arguments Section

The present Office Action seems to allege the Schieve reference discloses multi-

tasking. To the extent the Schieve reference may mention a master handler causes the

storing of pertinent information relative to that on which {sic} a microprocessor had

been working when the interrupt occurred [Col. 4, lines 40-44], Applicant respectfully

asserts the Schieve reference does not teach performing multi-tasking operations while

accessing serial presence detect information during boot up operations. For example,

the present Application indicates in one exemplary implementation the interrupt driven

mode permits the system to begin a fetch operation and proceed with other tasks while

waiting for the information to be returned [page 8 paragraph 17]. The present

Application also includes exemplary multi-tasking operations that can be performed

before completing the initialization of a volatile memory, including for example, a

system can initialize a chipset, put static information in registers, initialize GPIOs,

initialize a DMA controller, initialize a timer controller, etc. [page 7 paragraph 15].

Furthermore, to the extent the Schieve reference may mention several items including subcomponent 43 of device 42 is selected for testing, an interrupt from subcomponent 43 is sent to PIC 32, loading of TLB 30, and master handler 56 causes the storing of pertinent information relative to that upon which microprocessor 10 had been working {sic} when the interrupt occurred [Col. 4, lines 15 – 55], Applicant respectfully asserts the Schieve reference teaches away from multitasking. For example, Applicant respectfully asserts the Schieve reference teaches away from beginning a fetch operation and proceeding with other tasks while waiting for the information to be returned.

In the Response to Arguments Section, the present Office Action seems to be alleging that the pertinent information relative to that on which microprocessor 10 had been working {sic} when the interrupt occurred [Col. 4, lines 15 – 55] is the same as the system management bus communicating serial presence detect data in an interrupt mode. Applicant respectfully asserts the Schieve reference does not teach a system management bus communicating serial presence detect data in an interrupt mode. Applicant also respectfully asserts that in another part the present Office Action also acknowledges Schieve fails to disclose a multi-tasking bootstrap system wherein the system management bus communicates serial presence detect data in an interrupt mode (page 7 second paragraph of present Office Action).

The present Office Action seems to allege that the Skrovan et al. reference teaches a control signal generator produces a control signal that includes an interrupt signal in a system that has already booted up. Again, Applicant respectfully asserts software models running on a system that has already (emphasis added) booted up do not teach operations during (emphasis added) boot up. Applicant respectfully asserts the Skrovan et al. reference does not teach operating a system management bus controller in a multi-tasking environment in which the system management bus controller operates in an interrupt driven mode prior to completing volatile memory initialization. Applicant respectfully asserts the Skrovan et al. reference does not teach multi-tasking.

The present Office Action reiterates the previous rejections. Applicant respectfully reasserts the cited references do not teach the present claimed invention.

102 Rejections

Claims 1 – 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schieve (US Patent 6,018,808). Applicant respectfully asserts that the present invention as recited in Claims 1 – 3 and 7 are neither shown nor suggested by the Schieve reference.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the Schieve reference is not directed to the present invention as recited in Claim 1. Specifically the present invention, as set forth in independent Claim 1 recites in part:

... processor configured to ... perform multi-tasking operations while accessing serial presence detect information during boot up operations prior to completing volatile memory initialization.

To the extent the Schieve reference may mention a master handler causes the storing of pertinent information relative to that on which {sic} a microprocessor had been working when the interrupt occurred [Col. 4, lines 40 - 44], Applicant respectfully asserts the Schieve reference does not teach performing multi-tasking operations while accessing serial presence detect information during boot up operations. Applicant also respectfully asserts the present Office Action acknowledges the Schieve reference fails to disclose a multi-tasking bootstrap system wherein the system management bus communicates serial presence detect data in an interrupt mode (page 7 second paragraph of present Office Action).

Applicant respectfully asserts Claims 1 - 7 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent Claim.

Claims 8 - 9 and 11 - 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by Skrovan et al. (US Patent 6,016,554). Applicant respectfully asserts that the present

invention as recited in Claims 8 – 9 and 11 - 17 are neither shown nor suggested by the

Skrovan et al. reference.

Applicant respectfully assert that the Skrovan et al. reference is not directed to

the present invention as recited in Claim 8. Specifically the present invention, as set

forth in independent Claim 8 recites in part:

...interrupt vector table information stored in a non volatile

memory;...

programming a system management bus controller; and

operating said system management bus controller in a multi-

tasking environment in which said system management bus

controller operates in an interrupt driven mode prior to completing

volatile memory initialization.

To the extent the Skrovan et al. reference may mention a memory model implemented

in software includes a memory control unit which includes a control signal generator 24

[Col. 3, lines 9 - 11], Applicant respectfully asserts the Skrovan et al. reference does not

teach operating a system management bus controller in an interrupt driven mode in a

multi-tasking environment. Applicant respectfully asserts software models running on a system that has already booted up do not teach boot up operations.

Applicant respectfully asserts Claims 8 - 17 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent Claim 8.

103 REJECTIONS

The present Office Action indicates Claims 4 - 6 and 18 - 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schieve (US Patent 6,018,808) in view of Skrovan et al. (US Patent 6,016,554). Applicant respectfully asserts that the present invention is neither shown nor suggested by the Schieve nor Skrovan et al. references, alone or together in combination.

Applicant respectfully assert that the Schieve reference is not directed to the present invention as recited in Claim 18. As set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the present invention is neither shown nor suggested by the Schieve reference. The present Office Action acknowledges the Schieve reference fails to disclose programming a system management bus controller, and also fails to teach operating the system management bus controller in a multi-tasking environment in

which the system management bus controller operates in an interrupt driven mode prior to completing volatile memory initialization, wherein operating the system management bus controller includes retrieving serial presence detect data.

Applicant respectfully asserts the Skrovan reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Schieve reference. As set forth above to the extent the Skrovan et al. reference may mention a memory model implemented in software includes a memory control unit which includes a control signal generator 24 [Col. 3, lines 9-11], Applicant respectfully asserts the Skrovan et al. reference does not teach operating a system management bus controller in an interrupt driven mode in a multi-tasking environment. Applicant respectfully asserts software models running on a system that has already booted up do not teach boot up operations.

Applicant respectfully asserts Claims 19 - 20 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent Claim 18.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Date: 3/27/, 2007

John F. Ryan
Reg. No. 47,050

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060